



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/712,869

11/12/2003

Keiichi Iwamura

CFA00018US

8628

34904

7590

01/23/2008

CANON U.S.A. INC. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION
15975 ALTON PARKWAY
IRVINE, CA 92618-3731

EXAMINER

KANE, CORDELIA P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2132

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/23/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

AK

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/712,869	IWAMURA, KEIICHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cordelia Kane	2132	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-9,12,14,15,18-22 and 24-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-9,12,14,15,18-22 and 24-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 17, 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

3. Claims 1, 2, 5 – 9, 12, 14, and 18 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bisbee, and further in view of Smith US Patent 6,918,083 B2.

Referring to claims 1, 18 and 22, Bisbee teaches:

- a. Inputting means for inputting the original data and original data assuring information (column 11, lines 43-44).
- b. Means for every time an original document is modified storing that document (column 14, lines 5-9) including its new data-assuring information (column 13, line 50).

- c. Outputting means for outputting the original data, the original data assuring information (column 6, lines 57-59) and the ability to output all the documents, including their assuring information so that the activities on them may be tracked (column 14, lines 11-12).
4. Bisbee does not explicitly disclose generating modification information that indicates how to modify the original data to obtain modified original data, and storing that modification information. However, Smith discloses creating a file for storing the user markups or modifications (column 3, line 21-30). Bisbee and Smith are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, digital documents. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bisbee and Smith before him or her, to modify the document storage and verification of Bisbee to include the markup information of Smith. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to notify associated authority of changes about to be made to a document (column 1, lines 58-61).
5. Referring to claims 2 and 19, Bisbee teaches determining means for determining whether the modification information is valid, then creating means creates the modification assuring information (column 13, lines 42-50). The modification information is submitted with the file through a transfer agent that attests to its validity, and then the modification assuring information is created (column 13, lines 42-50).
6. Referring to claims 5 and 21, Bisbee teaches that the modification-assuring-information and original-data-assuring information are a digital signatures (column 13, line 50).

7. Referring to claim 6, Smith teaches that the modification information includes information for identifying the original data, and the modification process performed when the original data was modified (columns 2-3, table 1, column 3, lines 31-35).
8. Referring to claim 7, Bisbee teaches that the modification information includes the original data and difference information between the original data and modified data with respect to the original data (columns 2-3, table 1, column 3, lines 31-35).
9. Referring to claim 8, Bisbee teaches that the determination by the determining means is performed using pre-set access permission (column 16, lines 25-28). Using the public key to verify TCU's digital signature indicates pre-set access permission since only private key that associates with the public key can decrypt the TCU's digital signature.
10. Referring to claim 9, Bisbee teaches that the determining means is performed using public key of the author of the original data (column 16, lines 25-28).
11. Referring to claims 12 and 20, Bisbee teaches:
 - d. Inputting means for inputting the original data, original data assuring information (column 11, lines 43-44).
 - e. Means for every time an original document is modified storing that document (column 14, lines 5-9) including its new data-assuring information (column 13, line 50).
 - f. Original data verifying means for verifying the original data assuring information (column 16, lines 35-40). The same verifying means is used on every document.

- g. Only accepting a file after verifying the documents, including the content and it's digital signature (column 5, line 66-column 6, line 4).
12. Bisbee does not explicitly disclose modification information that indicates how to modify the original document and modifying means for modifying the original data in accordance with the modification information. However, Smith discloses markup information that discloses the modifications to the data (column 3, lines 21-30) and receiving the file, accepting the markups and then storing the modified file (column 3, lines 63-67).
13. Bisbee and Smith are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, digital documents. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bisbee and Smith before him or her, to modify the document verification and storage of Bisbee to include the markup information of Smith. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to notify associated authority of changes about to be made to a document (column 1, lines 58-61).
14. Referring to claim 14, Bisbee teaches that the original data verifying means verifies a digital signature for the original data and the modification-information verifying means verifies a digital signature for the modification (column 16, lines 25-28).
15. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bisbee as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ginter et al (US Pat No. 5982891), hereafter "Ginter".

16. Bisbee discloses an information processing apparatus that manages the original data assuring information, the modification information, and the modification assuring information (column 13, lines 46-50) over a network (column 11, lines 26 and 44-45).

17. However Bisbee does not disclose a server that is connected with the information processing apparatus over a network wherein the server receives and manages the original-data assuring information, the modification information and the modification assuring information.

18. Ginter on the other hand discloses a server (col. 17, lines 60-63) that is connected with the information processing apparatus over a network wherein the server receives and manages the original-data assuring information, the modification information and the modification assuring information.

19. It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at that time of the applicant's invention was made to modify the method of Bisbee such that to incorporate a server that is connect with the information processing apparatus over a network, as taught by Ginter to provide a new kind of "virtual distribution environment" or VDE to secures, administer, and audit electronic information that travel across the information highway (col. 2, lines 22-27).

20. Claims 24 – 27 are rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being obvious over Bisbee in view of Smith in view of Menezes US Patent 5,473,691. Bisbee in view of Smith discloses all the limitations of the parent claim, including sending the data (Bisbee, column 6, lines 57-59 and Smith, column 3, lines 29-30). Bisbee in view of Smith does

not explicitly disclose including a header with the file, the header storing modification information. However, Menezes discloses having an attachment header containing information on processing to be performed on the attached data (column 33, lines 14-16). Bisbee, Smith and Menezes are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, data transmission. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bisbee in view of Smith and Menezes before him or her, to modify the file of Bisbee in view of Smith to include a header containing information on processing of Menezes. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been so that the receiver knows what processing to perform on the data block (page 33, lines 14-16).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cordelia Kane whose telephone number is 571-272-7771. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/712,869
Art Unit: 2132

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CPK
Cordelia Kane
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2132

[Signature]
Benjamin E. Carter
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2132